UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/901,683	07/11/2001	Bahadir Erimli	95-509	8967

20736 7590 03/25/2004

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER
2000 M STREET NW SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-3307

EXAMINER	
WILSON, YOLANDA L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2113	4

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/901,683	ERIMLI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yolanda Wilson	2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 July 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,5,7-9 and 12* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *3,4,6,10,11 and 13* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 3,4,6,10,11,13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The Information Disclosure Statement for this application has not been considered because the 1449 form and the documents associated with that form could not be located when this application was first examined; therefore, a new 1449 and documents associated with that form are needed with the response to this office action in order for the IDS to be considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1,2,5,7,8,9,12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Craddock et al. (US Publication Number 20030005039A1) in view of Mahalingham et al. (USPN 6314525B1). As appears in claim 1, Craddock et al. discloses first and second host channel adapters configured for respective first and second communication operations with the InfiniBand™ network on page 3, paragraphs 0036,0037.

Craddock et al. fails to explicitly state a processor configured for monitoring the first and second communication operations and detecting a failure in any one of the first and second communication operations wherein the processor in response to detecting the failure as affecting the first communication operations by the first host channel adapter is configured for causing the first communication operations to be transferred to the second host channel adapter.

Mahalingham discloses these limitations in column 6, lines 21-39; column 7, line 55 – column 8, line 20.

Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have a processor configured for monitoring the first and second communication operations and detecting a failure in any one of the first and second communication operations wherein the processor in response to detecting the failure as affecting the first communication operations by the first host channel adapter is configured for causing the first communication operations to be transferred to the second host channel adapter because having multiple adapters adds failover ability if one of the adapters fails when monitored for failures. Mahalingham discloses this in column 1, lines 36-53.

5. As per claims 2 and 9, Craddock et al. discloses first and second host channel adapters are configured for transfer of first and second InfiniBand™ network traffic on page 3, paragraphs 0036,0037.

Craddock et al. fails to explicitly state the processor configured for transferring the first communication operations to the second host channel adapter by redirecting the first InfiniBand™ network traffic to the second channel adapter.

Mahalingham discloses these limitations in column 6, lines 21-39; column 7, line 55 – column 8, line 20.

Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the processor configured for transferring the first communication operations to the second host channel adapter by redirecting the first InfiniBand™ network traffic to the second channel adapter because having multiple adapters adds failover ability if one of the adapters fails when monitored for failures. Mahalingham discloses this in column 1, lines 36-53.

6. As per claim 5, Craddock et al. discloses an internal bus configured for first communications between the processor and the first host channel adapter on page 2, paragraph 0027.

Craddock et al. fails to explicitly state the processor configured for causing the first communication operations to be transferred to the second host channel adapter in response to detecting a failure in the first communications.

Mahalingham discloses these limitations in column 6, lines 21-39; column 7, line 55 – column 8, line 20.

Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the processor configured for causing the first communication operations to be transferred to the second host channel adapter in response to detecting a failure in the first communications because having multiple adapters adds failover ability if one of the adapters fails when monitored for failures. Mahalingham discloses this in column 1, lines 36-53.

7. As per claim 7, Craddock fails to explicitly state the processor is configured for causing the first communication operations to be transferred to the second host channel adapter in response to detecting a failure in the first host channel adapter.

Mahalingham discloses these limitations in column 6, lines 21-39; column 7, line 55 – column 8, line 20.

Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the processor is configured for causing the first communication operations to be transferred to the second host channel adapter in response to detecting a failure in the first host channel adapter because having multiple adapters adds failover ability if one of the adapters fails when monitored for failures. Mahalingham discloses this in column 1, lines 36-53.

8. As per claim 8, Craddock et al. discloses configuring first and second host channel adapters within the computing node for respective first and second communication operations with the InfiniBand™ network on page 3, paragraphs 0036,0037.

Craddock et al. fails to explicitly state detecting a failure in the first communication operations by the processor within the computing node and transferring the first communication operations to the second host channel adapter by the processor based on the detected failure.

Mahalingham discloses these limitations in column 6, lines 21-39; column 7, line 55 – column 8, line 20.

Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to detect a failure in the first communication operations by the processor within the computing node and transfer the first communication operations to the second host channel adapter by the processor based on the detected failure because having multiple adapters adds failover ability if one of the adapters fails when monitored for failures. Mahalingham discloses this in column 1, lines 36-53.

9. As per claim 12, Craddock et al. discloses an internal bus configured for first communications between the processor and the first host channel adapter on page 2, paragraph 0027.

Craddock et al. fails to explicitly state the detecting step detecting a failure in the first communications.

Mahalingham discloses these limitations in column 6, lines 21-39; column 7, line 55 – column 8, line 20.

Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the detecting step detecting a failure in the first communications because having multiple adapters adds failover ability if one of the adapters fails when monitored for failures. Mahalingham discloses this in column 1, lines 36-53.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yolanda Wilson whose telephone number is (703) 305-3298. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (703) 305-9713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100